arXiv:math/0105227v1 [math.QA] 28 May 2001

DISCRETIZATION, MOYAL, AND INTEGRABILITY

ROBERT CARROLL
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA, IL 61801

À la mémoire de Joan

Abstract. Connections of KP, qKP, and Moyal type dKP constructions are developed. Some expansion of the Moyal KP constructions of Kemmoku-Saito is given with clarification of the role of spectral variables as a phase space.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is a kind of sequel to [7] with connections to integrable systems. It is partially expository, clarifying the exposition in [5] based on work of Kemmoku and Saito [31, 32, 33, 34], and some new aspects are indicated concerning q-integrable systems and Moyal deformations. In [7] we showed how a certain phase space discretization in [31, 32, 33] is related to a q-discretization leading to a new q-Moyal type bracket. We discuss here, following [31, 33], also an analogous q-discretization for KP related functions $A(z,\zeta) = \sum a_{mn}z^m\zeta^n$ with spectral variables (z,ζ) as phase space entities. The version in [5] is expanded and clarified. We also indicate some features of q-KP following [1, 3, 15, 29, 30, 59] and describe connections to dispersionless theories and Moyal following [27, 56].

2. BACKGROUND AND ORIENTATION

We run in parallel here the phase space discretization of [31, 32, 33], as expanded in [5, 7], together with the KP variants of [31, 33] as described in [5] (with some correction of typos, etc.). Thus for the phase space picture involving $\mathbf{x} = (x,p)$ one has $(f = f(x,p))$

$$X_f^D = \int da_1 da_2 v_\lambda[f](x,p,a_1,a_2)\nabla_{\mathbf{a}};\ \nabla_{\mathbf{a}} = \frac{1}{\lambda}Sinh(\lambda\sum a_i\partial_i); \tag{2.1}$$

$$v_\lambda[f] = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^2\int db_1 db_2 e^{-i\lambda(a_1b_2-a_2b_1)}f(x+\lambda b_1, p+\lambda b_2)$$

$$X_f^D = \frac{\lambda^3}{4\pi^2}\int d\mathbf{a}\int d\mathbf{b}e^{-i\lambda(\mathbf{a}\times\mathbf{b})}\nabla_{\mathbf{b}}f\nabla_{\mathbf{a}};\ X_f^D g = \{f,g\}_M;\ [X_f^D, X_g^D]h = X^D_{\{f,g\}_M}h \tag{2.2}$$

A variation of this in a q-lattice was developed in [7] (cf. also [14]) involving

$$X_f^D = \sum_{m,n} v_q[f](x,p,m,n)\check{\nabla}_{mn};\ v_q[f] = \sum_{r,s} q^{ms-nr}f(q^r x, q^s p); \tag{2.3}$$

Date: May, 2001 - email: rcarroll@math.uiuc.edu.

$$\check{\nabla}_{mn}g=\frac{g(xq^m,pq^n)-g(xq^{-m},pq^{-n})}{(q^m-q^{-m})(q^n-q^n)xp};$$

$$X_f^D g=\frac{1}{2xp}\sum_{m,n,r,s}q^{ms-nr}\frac{[f(q^rx,q^sp)-f(q^{-r}x,q^{-s}p)][g(q^mx,q^np)-g(q^{-m}x,q^{-n}p)]}{(q^m-q^{-m})(q^n-q^{-n})}$$

Here the lattice structure was given a priori (no connection to λ) and the role of λ is played by $q^m-q^{-m},\ q^n-q^{-n}$, etc. For the KP situation with (**P1**) $A(z,\zeta)=\sum a_{mn}z^m\zeta^n$ $(m,n\in\mathbf{Z})$ one writes

$$(2.4)\quad X_A^D=\int d\mathbf{a}v_\lambda[A]\nabla_{\mathbf{a}};\ \nabla_{\mathbf{a}}\sim\frac{1}{\lambda}Sin(\lambda\mathbf{a}\cdot\partial);\ v_\lambda[A]=\frac{\lambda^2}{4\pi^2}\int d\mathbf{b}e^{-i\lambda(\mathbf{a}\times\mathbf{b})}A(\mathbf{x}+i\lambda\mathbf{b})$$

where $z\sim e^p$ and $\zeta\sim e^x$ with $\mathbf{x}\sim(x,p)$ so for $A_{mn}=z^m\zeta^n$ one has (**P2**) $A_{mn}(\mathbf{x}+i\lambda\mathbf{b})=e^{mp}e^{nx}exp(i\lambda(mb_2+nb_1)=exp[m(p+i\lambda b_2)]exp[n(x+i\lambda b_1)]$ (note $\partial_x=\zeta\partial_\zeta=\partial_{log(\zeta)}$, etc.). Then (specifying $\nabla_{mn}\sim\nabla_{m,-n}$)

$$(2.5)\qquad v_\lambda[A_{mn}]=A_{mn}\delta(m-a_1)\delta(n+a_2);$$

$$X^D_{A_{mn}}=A_{mn}\nabla_{mn}=A_{mn}\frac{1}{\lambda}Sin[\lambda(m\partial_{log(\zeta)}-n\partial_{log(z)}]$$

Further, for (**P3**) $X^D_{mn}=z^m\zeta^n\nabla_{mn}\sim z^m\zeta^n\nabla_{m,-n}$, one has

$$(2.6)\qquad X_A^D=\sum a_{mn}z^m\zeta^n\nabla_{mn}=\sum A_{mn}\nabla_{mn}=\sum a_{mn}X^D_{A_{mn}};$$

$$[X^D_{mn},X^D_{pq}]=\frac{1}{\lambda}Sin[\lambda(np-mq)]X^D_{m+p,n+q}$$

and for $f,g\sim A,B$ one has (**P4**) $[X_A^D,X_B^D]=-X_{\{A,B\}_M}$ with

$$(2.7)\qquad \{A,B\}_M=\frac{-1}{\lambda}Sin\left[\lambda(\partial_{log(z_1)}\partial_{\log(\zeta_2)}-\partial_{log(\zeta_1)}\partial_{log(z_2)})\right]A(z_1,\zeta_1)B(z_2,\zeta_2)|_{(z,\zeta)}$$

Next recall from [5, 31]

$$(2.8)\qquad P_{F_w}=\frac{\hbar}{4}\int d\mathbf{a}\int d\mathbf{b}e^{i\hbar(\mathbf{a}\times\mathbf{b})}F_w(\mathbf{x}+(\hbar/2)\mathbf{b})\Delta^{\mathbf{a}}$$

where $<\Delta^{\mathbf{b}},\nabla_{\mathbf{a}}>=\delta_{ba}$ and F_w is the Wigner function

$$(2.9)\qquad F_w(p,x)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int dy\phi\left(x+\frac{\hbar}{2}y\right)\phi^*\left(x-\frac{\hbar}{2}y\right)e^{-ipy}$$

Then for $X_f^Q=\hbar X_f^D$ one has (**P5**) $<P_{F_w},X_f^Q>=\int dxdpF_w(x,p)f(x,p)=<\hat{f}>$. For KP we have from [5, 31]

$$(2.10)\qquad F_{KP}(z,\zeta)=\int dx\sum_{\ell\in\mathbf{Z}}\psi(q^{\ell/2}z)\psi^*(q^{-\ell/2}z)\zeta^{-\ell}=\sum f_{mn}z^{-m}\zeta^{-n}$$

Let now (**P6**) $<\Delta^{mn},\nabla_{pq}>=\delta_{mp}\delta_{nq}$ and write for $A=\sum a_{mn}z^m\zeta^n$

$$(2.11)\qquad \Omega_{F_{KP}}(z,\zeta)=\sum_{mn}f_{mn}z^{-m}\zeta^{-n}\Delta^{mn};$$

$$< \Omega_{F_{KP}}, X_A^D >= -\oint \frac{dz}{2\pi iz}\oint \frac{d\zeta}{2\pi i\zeta} F_{KP}(z,\zeta)A(z,\zeta) = \sum f_{mn}a_{mn}$$

In particular for $X^D_{mn} = z^m\zeta^n\nabla_{mn}$ one has

$$f_{mn} =< \Omega_{F_{KP}}, X^D_{mn} >= -\int dx \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi iz} z^m\psi(q^{n/2}z)\psi^*(q^{-n/2}z) \tag{2.12}$$

We now recall the Orlov-Schulman operators (cf. [9, 16, 17, 53]), i.e. (**P7**) $z^m\partial_z^\ell\phi = M^\ell L^m\phi$ with flow equations $\partial_{m\ell}\phi = -(M^\ell L^m)_-\phi$ for $\phi = Wexp(\xi)$ (i.e. $z^m\partial_z^\ell \sim \partial_{m\ell}$). Recall also $L\phi = z\phi$ and $\partial_n\phi = L^n_+\phi$; from this (**P8**) $(\partial_n - L^n_+)W = W(\partial_n - \partial^n)$ and $\partial_n W = (\partial_n W) + W\partial_n$ implies $(\partial_n W)W^{-1} = L^n_+ - W\partial^n W^{-1} = -L^n_-$ or $\partial_n W = -L^n_- W$ (Sato equation). Then one can rewrite the right side Ξ of (2.12) in terms of the $\partial_{m\ell}$. Indeed $q^{nz\partial_z}\psi(z) = \psi(q^n z)$ and under a change of variables $z \to q^{n/2}z$ the integrand in (2.12) becomes $(dz/2\pi iz)(q^{n/2}z)^m\psi(q^n z)\psi^*(z)$ so

$$\Xi = -\int dx \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi iz}\left(z^m q^{n[z\partial_z+(m/2)]}\psi(z)\right)\psi^*(z) \tag{2.13}$$

One can write then for $\lambda = log(q)$ a formula (**P9**) $q^{nz\partial_z} = exp(n\lambda z\partial_z) = \sum_0^\infty (n\lambda)^j(z\partial_z)^j/j!$ so

$$\Xi = -\int dxq^{mn/2}\oint \frac{dz}{2\pi iz}z^m\left(\sum_0^\infty \frac{(n\lambda)^j}{j!}z^j\partial_z^j\psi(z)\right)\psi^*(z) = \tag{2.14}$$

$$= -\int dxq^{nm/2}\sum_{j=0}^\infty \frac{(n\lambda)^j}{j!}\oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i}\left(z^{m+j-1}\partial_z^j\psi(z)\right)\psi^*(z)$$

Now from **(P7)** we can write (**P10**) $\partial_{m\ell}\psi = -(M^\ell L^m)_-\psi$ with $z^m\partial_z^\ell\psi = M^\ell L^m\psi$ while in [31] we have (**P11**) $\partial_{m+\ell,\ell}\partial log(\tau) = \oint[dz/2\pi i](z^{m+\ell}\partial_z^\ell\psi(z))\psi^*(z) = Res(z^{m+\ell}\partial_z^\ell\psi(z))\psi^*(z)$. There are various formulas in this direction and we recall some results from [9, 16, 18, 19, 48, 52]. Thus one has a lemma of Dickey that for $P = \sum p_k\partial^{-k}$ and $Q = \sum q_k\partial^{-k}$ follows $Res_\lambda(Pexp(\lambda x)Qexp(-\lambda x) = Res_\partial PQ^*$ (here $x^* = x$, $\partial^* = -\partial$, and $(AB)^* = B^*A^*$). Now set $W = 1 + \sum_1^\infty w_j\partial^{-j}$ and $(W^*)^{-1} = 1 + \sum_1^\infty w_j^*\partial^{-j}$. The flow equations are $\partial_m u = \partial Res(L^m) = \partial Res(L^m_-)$ corresponding, for $w = w_1$ (with $u = -\partial w$), to $-\partial_m\partial w = \partial Res(L^m)$ or $\partial_m w = -Res(L^m) = Res(L^m_-)$. One knows also (**P12**) $Res(M^nL^{m+1}) = Res(z^{m+1}\partial_z^n\psi)\psi^*$. Further $\psi\psi^* = 1 - \sum_1^\infty[\partial_i w/z^{i+1}]$ with $\partial_1 \sim \partial_x,\ \partial_2 \sim \partial_y,\ \partial_3 \sim \partial_t, \cdots$. This corresponds to $\psi\psi^* = \sum s_n z^{-n}$ with $\partial s_{n+1} = \partial_n u \sim \partial s_{n+1} = -\partial_n\partial w \sim s_{n+1} = -\partial_n w$. Thus one writes

$$Res(z^m\partial_z^n\psi)\psi^* = ResM^nL^m \tag{2.15}$$

and in [31] $\partial_{k\ell}$ is defined via (**P13**) $\partial_{k\ell}W = -(M^\ell L^k)_- W$ (additional Sato equations - cf. **(P8)**). Consequently using the Dickey lemma for $w = w_1$ and **(P13)** with $L\psi = z\psi$ and $\partial_z\psi = M\psi$ ($[L, M] = 1$) one looks at $\partial_{k\ell}w = -Res_\partial(M^\ell L^k)$. Set $P = Wx^\ell\partial^k$ and $Q = (W^*)^{-1}$ so $Q^* = W^{-1}$ and $PQ^* = Wx^\ell\partial^k W^{-1} = Wx^\ell W^{-1}W\partial^k W^{-1}$. Now one can define L, M also via $L = W\partial W^{-1}$ and $M = W(\sum kt_k\partial^{k-1})W^{-1}$ so for $\psi = wexp(\xi)$

we have $M\psi = W(\sum kt_k\partial^{k-1})exp(\xi) = W(\sum kt_k z^{k-1})exp(\xi) = W\partial_z exp(\xi) = \partial_z\psi$ and $L\psi = W\partial exp(\xi) = z\psi$. Hence ($e^{\pm\xi}$ replaces $e^{\pm zx}$ in an obvious manner where $\xi = \sum t_n z^n$)

$$\partial_{k\ell}w = -Res_\partial M^\ell L^k = -Res_z(Pe^\xi)(Qe^{-\xi}) = -Res_z(Wx^\ell\partial^k e^\xi(W^*)^{-1}e^{-\xi}) = \tag{2.16}$$

$$= -Res_z[z^k W(x^\ell e^\xi)(W^*)^{-1}e^{-\xi}] = -Res_z\left(z^k[\partial_z^\ell\psi(z)]\psi^*(z)\right)$$

Now in [5] there is some confusion about using $\oint dz/2\pi i$ or $\oint dz/2\pi iz$ as a symbol for a residue. If the former is adopted consistently then (2.14) becomes (via (2.16))

$$\Xi = -\int dxq^{mn/2}\sum_{j=0}^\infty\frac{(n\lambda)^j}{j!}Res\left[\left(z^{m+j-1}\partial_z^j\psi(z)\right)\psi^*(z)\right] = \tag{2.17}$$

$$= \int dxq^{mn/2}\sum_{j=0}^\infty\frac{(n\lambda)^j}{j!}\partial_{m+j-1,j}w$$

where $u = -\partial w \Rightarrow w = -\partial^{-1}\partial^2 log(\tau) = -\partial log(\tau)$ which leads to

$$\Xi = \int dx\mathcal{D}_{mn}\left(-\partial log(\tau)\right);\ \mathcal{D}_{mn} = q^{mn/2}\sum_{j=0}^\infty\frac{(n\lambda)^j}{j!}\partial_{m+j-1,j}; \tag{2.18}$$

$$f_{mn} =< \Omega_{F_{KP}}, X^D_{mn} >= \int dx\mathcal{D}_{mn}(-\partial log(\tau))$$

Thus actually it is F_{KP} in (2.10) which generates $\mathcal{D}_{mn}$ via X^D_{mn} (which eliminates the a_{mn} in (2.10)). One can write now $\mathcal{D}_A = \sum a_{mn}\mathcal{D}_{mn}$ with

$$< \Omega_{F_{KP}}, X^D_A >= \int dx\mathcal{D}_A(-\partial log(\tau)) = \tilde{A}(t); \tag{2.19}$$

$$\partial_r\tilde{A} = -\int dx\mathcal{D}_A(\partial_r\partial log(\tau)) = -\int dx\mathcal{D}_A J_r$$

where $J_r = \partial_r\partial log(\tau)$ is a first integral of KP (i.e. $H_r = \int dxJ_r$ is a Hamiltonian). Here one recalls that $s_{n+1} = \partial^{-1}\partial_n u = \partial_n\partial og(\tau) = J_n$ are conserved densities (cf. [9] and note that the $\partial s_{n+1} = K_{n+1} = \partial_n u$ are symmetries determining the standard KP flows). Note also that the $\mathcal{D}_{mn}$ flows are independent and commuting with the ∂_r so $\mathcal{D}_A$ is independent and commutes with ∂_r. Now one defines (**P14**) $-\int dx\mathcal{D}_A J_r = \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}}\cdot H_r = \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}}\cdot\int dxJ_r$ where $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}}$ corresponds to a Hamiltonian vector field (e.g. X_f acting as $X_f g$ in (2.2)); i.e. one writes

$$\partial_r\tilde{A} = \{\tilde{A}, H_r\}^{KP}_M \tag{2.20}$$

This is rather a stretch of imagination but perhaps morally correct at least since it is consistent with the Heisenberg notation (**P15**) $dA/dt = \{A, H\}_M$. Here $\{\tilde{A}, H_r\}^{KP}_M$ makes no recourse to phase space variables z, ζ however and any relation to e.g. (2.7) is vague at best. As in [5] we can say however that $\partial_r\tilde{A} = \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}}\cdot H_r$ has the structure $\partial_r < \Omega_{F_{KP}}, X^D_A >= \partial_r\tilde{A}$ and one imagines e.g. a Heisenberg picture

$$\partial_t X^D_A = -[X^D_A, X^D_H] = X_{\{A,H\}_M} \equiv \partial_t < \Omega_{F_w}, X^D_A(t) >=< \Omega_{F_w}, X^D_{\{A(t),H\}_M} > \tag{2.21}$$

(cf. also [5, 7]).

REMARK 2.1. The q-lattice version (2.3) of phase space discretization was developed following an analogue of Fourier transform techniques dealing with (2.1) - (2.2). On the other hand (2.5), derived via $z \sim e^p$ and $\zeta \sim e^x$, leads for $q \sim exp(i\lambda)$ to

$$X^D_{A_{mn}} B(\zeta, z) = \frac{1}{2i\lambda}[B(q^m\zeta, q^{-n}z) - B(q^{-m}\zeta, q^n z)] \tag{2.22}$$

which has some similarity to $\check{\nabla}_{mn} g$ of (2.3). In accord with procedures in [7] one might expect here a directive to modify λ in the denominator of (2.22) via e.g. $(q^m - q^{-m})(q^n - q^{-n})z\zeta$. At first sight one is tempted to look for ζ, z as arising in vertex operators (cf. [1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, 49])

$$X(z,\zeta,t)\tau = e^{\sum_1^\infty t_k(\zeta^k - z^k)} e^{\sum_1^\infty (z^{-k} - \zeta^{-k})\partial_k/k}\tau = \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{(\zeta - z)^m}{m!} \sum_{p=-\infty}^\infty z^{-p-n} W_p^m \tau \tag{2.23}$$

(where the W_p^m are expressed in terms of currents J_k^v involving time derivatives ∂_n) leading perhaps to a new perspective on vertex operators. The dynamical analogies are not immediately clear but an origin of spectral variables as phase space variables is suggested in Remark 4.2 via the anti-isomorphism of PSDO and the z-operators of Dickey (cf. [18, 19]). Nevertheless we give here for completeness a few more formulas involving vertex operators. Thus one can imagine of course a Taylor type expansion (cf. [2])

$$X(z,\zeta,t) = \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{(\zeta - z)^m}{m!}\partial_\zeta^m X(z,\zeta,t)|_{\zeta=z};\ \partial_\zeta^m X(z,\zeta,t)|_{\zeta=z} = \sum_{p=-\infty}^\infty z^{-p-m} W_p^m \tag{2.24}$$

which would suggest that for $n \in \mathbf{Z}$

$$Res[z^n \partial_\zeta^m X(z,\zeta,t)]|_{\zeta=z} = W^m_{n-m+1} \tag{2.25}$$

(i.e. $n - p - m = -1$) and for $n = m + s$ this gives W^m_{s+1}. A variation on this (Adler-Shiota-van Moerbeke theorem) involves (**P16**) $Res[z^{m+s}\partial_z^m X(z,\zeta,t)|_{\zeta=z}\tau \sim W_s^{m+1}\tau/(m+1)$ or more generally (cf. [1, 16, 49])

$$-\frac{(M^m L^{m+s})_-\psi}{\psi} \sim \frac{Y_{m+s,m}\psi}{\psi} = (e^\eta - 1)\frac{W_s^{m+1}\tau}{(m+1)\tau} \tag{2.26}$$

where $[exp(-\eta) - 1]f(t) = f(t - [z^{-1}]) - f(t)$ via $\eta = \sum_1^\infty \partial_j/jz^j$ (note in (2.26) the last term requires some z dependence - further in taking residues only a $D(W_s^{m+1}\tau/\tau)$ term arises). A possible way now to envision z, ζ as phase space variables might be in terms of $\zeta \sim \partial_z$ or $z \sim L$ and $\zeta \sim M$. We recall also from [2] that the generating functions

$$W_\lambda^v = \sum_{-\infty}^\infty \lambda^{-p-v} W_p^v;\ J_\lambda^v = \sum_{-\infty}^\infty \lambda^{-p-v} J_p^v \tag{2.27}$$

can be considered as stress energy tensors and $(D \sim \partial_x)$

$$\psi^*(\lambda,t)\psi(\mu,t) = \sum_1^\infty \frac{(\mu - \lambda)^{j-1}}{j!} D\frac{W_\lambda^j(\tau)}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda} D\left(\frac{X(\lambda,\mu,t)\tau}{\tau}\right) \tag{2.28}$$

$$v\psi^*(\lambda,t)\partial_\lambda^{v-1}\psi(\lambda,t) = D\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\sum_{-\infty}^\infty \lambda^{-p-v} W_p^v(\tau)\right) \tag{2.29}$$

Hence from (2.29)

$$Res[\lambda^{\ell+v}\psi^*(\lambda,t)\partial_\lambda^v\psi(\lambda,t)] = \tag{2.30}$$

$$= Res\left[D\frac{1}{(v+1)\tau}\left(\sum_{-\infty}^{\infty}\lambda^{-p+\ell-1}W_p^{v+1}(\tau)\right)\right] = D\left(\frac{W_\ell^{v+1}(\tau)}{(v+1)\tau}\right)$$

which is consistent with (2.26). ■

In connection with KP and Moyal we add a few results from [27] (cf. also [5, 56, 57]). Thus let $\tilde{M} = M \oplus T$ where $T \sim$ times $\{t_n\}$ and for some $*$ product on M write

$$u(x,t) * v(x,y) = exp\left(\kappa\omega^{ij}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}^j}\right)u(x,t)v(\tilde{x},t)\Big|_{\tilde{x}=x} \tag{2.31}$$

(note $X_f = \omega^{ij}(\partial f(x,t)/\partial x^i)(\partial/\partial x^j)$ will be time dependent). Let $L = \partial + \sum_1^\infty u_n(x,t)\partial^{-n}$ be the Lax operator for KP. One then applies the geometrical framework to obtain a Moyal KP hierarchy KP_κ, based on deformation of dKP, which is equivalent to the Sato hierarchy based on PSDO. Similar calculations apply to Toda and dToda, KdV and dKdV, etc. Further the geometrical picture can be phrased in the $Sdiff_2$ format with $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{M}$ etc. It seems from this that if one starts with dKP as a basic Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonians $\mathcal{B}_n$ and standard P brackets then KP_κ can be considered as a quantization of dKP is some sense with quantum integrals of motion $B_n(\kappa)$ which for $\kappa = 1$ say is equivalent to KP (or $\kappa = 1/2$ in [27]). The $B_n(\kappa)$ would perhaps have to be extracted from KP after establishing the isomorphism (cf. [27]) and we turn briefly to this approach now. Thus in [27] one writes the Sato KP hierarchy via ($v_{-2} = 1$, $v_{-1} = 0$)

$$\partial_m L = [L_+^m, L]\ (m \geq 1);\ L = \sum_{-2}^{\infty} v_n(\tilde{x})\partial_x^{-n-1} \tag{2.32}$$

for $\tilde{x} = (x, t_2, \cdots)$ while the Moyal KP hierarchy is written via ($u_{-2} = 1$, $u_{-1} = 0$)

$$\Lambda = \sum_{-2}^{\infty} u_n(\tilde{x})\lambda^{-n-1};\ \partial_m\Lambda = \{\Lambda_+^m, \Lambda\}_M\ (m \geq 1) \tag{2.33}$$

where $\Lambda_+^m \sim (\Lambda^{*m})_+$ with

$$f * g = \sum_0^\infty \frac{\kappa^s}{s!}\sum_{j=0}^{s}(-1)^j\binom{s}{j}(\partial_x^j\partial_\lambda^{s-j}f)(\partial_x^{s-j}\partial_\lambda^j g) \tag{2.34}$$

leading to

$$\{f,g\}_\kappa = \sum_0^\infty \frac{\kappa^s}{(2s+1)!}\sum_{j=0}^{2s+1}(-1)^j\binom{2s+1}{j}(\partial_x^j\partial_\lambda^{2s+1-j}f)(\partial_x^{2s+1-j}\partial_\lambda^j g) \tag{2.35}$$

Note $lim_{\kappa\to 0}\{f,g\}_\kappa = \{f,g\} = f_\lambda g_x - f_x g_\lambda$ so $(KP)_M \to dKP$ as $\kappa \to 0$, namely $\partial_m\Lambda = \{\Lambda_+^m, \Lambda\}$ with $\Lambda^m \sim \Lambda\cdots\Lambda$. The isomorphism between $(KP)_{Sato}$ and $(KP)_M$ is then determined by relating v_n and u_n in the form ($\kappa = 1/2$)

$$u_n = \sum_0^n 2^{-j}\binom{n}{j} v^j_{n-j} \tag{2.36}$$

where $n = 0, 1, \cdots$ and $v^j = \partial_x^j v_0$.

Let us recall the KP_κ theory of [27, 56] where dKP is built up as follows (cf. [5, 11, 12, 57]). We will assume some familiarity with KP and dKP as in [5] and only recall formulas (extensive references are given in [5]). Then the KP Lax operator has the form (**P17**) $L = \partial + \sum_1^\infty u_{n+1}\partial^{-n}$ with $u_2 = u$ and $u_i = u_i(x, x_n)$ where $x_1 \sim x$. The x_n (or equivalently t_n) for $n \geq 2$ correspond to time variables with flows (**P18**) $\partial_n L = [B_n, L]$ for $B_n = L^n_+$. There is a dressing or gauge operator (**P19**) $W = 1 + \sum_1^\infty w_n \partial^{-n}$ determined via $L = W\partial W^{-1}$ ($\partial = \partial_x$). For wave functions or Baker-Akhiezer (BA) functions $\psi(x, \lambda) = Wexp(\xi)$, $\xi = \sum_1^\infty x_n\lambda^n$ one hs $L\psi = \lambda\psi$ and $\partial_m\psi = B_m\psi$. Further $\psi^* = (W^*)^{-1}exp(-\xi)$ and $L^*\psi^* = \lambda\psi^*$ with $\partial_m\psi^* = -B^*_n\psi^*$ (here $B^*_n = (L^*)^n_+$ and $\partial^* = -\partial$). The equation (**P20**) $\partial_n W = -L^n_- W$ is called the Sato equation. Concerning λ derivatives one has

$$\psi_\lambda = W\left(\sum_1^\infty kx_k\lambda^{k-1}\right)exp(\xi) = M\psi;\ M = W\left(\sum_1^\infty kx_k\partial^{k-1}\right)W^{-1} \tag{2.37}$$

and $[L, M] = 1$. The tau function arises in a vertex operator equation (VOE)

$$\psi(x, \lambda) = \frac{X(\lambda)\tau}{\tau} = e^\xi\frac{\tau_-}{\tau} = \frac{e^\xi}{\tau}\tau\left(x_j - \frac{1}{j\lambda^j}\right) \tag{2.38}$$

The Hirota bilinear identity is (**P21**) $0 = \oint_C \psi(x, \lambda)\psi^*(y, \lambda)d\lambda$, where C is a circle around $\lambda = \infty$, and this leads to various Hirota bilinear formulas. In particular one has ($\tilde{\partial} \sim (\partial_j/j)$)

$$\sum_0^\infty p_n(-2y)p_{n+1}(\tilde{\partial})exp\left(\sum_1^\infty y_j\partial_j\right)\tau\cdot\tau = 0 \tag{2.39}$$

where the p_j are Schur polynomials and (**P22**) $\partial_j^m a\cdot b = (\partial^m/\partial s_j^m)a(t_j+s_j)b(t-g-s_j)|_{s_j=0}$. The KP equation is included in (2.39) in the form (**P23**) $(\partial^4 + 3\partial_2^2 - 4\partial_1\partial_3)\tau\cdot\tau = 0$.

REMARK 2.2. For dKP traditionally one thinks of fast and slow variables $\epsilon t_i = T_i$ (shifting now $x_i \to t_i$ for $i \geq 2$ with $x_1 \sim x$) and $\partial_n \to \epsilon\partial/\partial T_n$ with $\partial = \partial_x \to \epsilon\partial_X$ and $\partial_x^{-1} \to (1/\epsilon)\partial_X^{-1}$. Then one writes $u_i(x, t_n) \to \tilde{u}_i(X, T_n)$ and this passage (where one usually assumed $u_i(X/\epsilon, T_n/\epsilon) = \tilde{u}(X, T_n) + O(\epsilon)$ has always seemed unrealistic; however in certain situations it is perfectly reasonable (see e.g. [5, 10] under (X, ψ) duality). A priori if one simply substitutes in a power series (**P24**) $\sum a_\alpha x^{\alpha_1}t_2^{\alpha_2}\cdots \to \sum a_\alpha\epsilon^{-\sum\alpha_i}X^{\alpha_1}T_2^{\alpha_2}\cdots$ there will be horrible divergences as $\epsilon \to 0$ so one is led to think of sums of simple homogeneous functions (e.g. $f(x, t_n) \to f(X/\epsilon, T_n/\epsilon) = \sum_0^\infty \epsilon^j F_j(X, T_n)$ with sums as in **(P24)** yielding terms with $-\sum\alpha_i \geq 0$. Note that this can be achieved for arbitrary powers of x and a finite number of t_n ($2 \leq n \leq N$) by insertion of some suitably large negative power of say t_{N+1} in each monomial; then one could worry about the meaning of t_{N+1} later. Perhaps this is an argument for some ultimate projectivization via T_{N+1} corresponding to some universal time. ■

In any event for dKP one writes ($T \sim (X, T_n)$ - cf. [5, 11, 12, 57])

$$L_\epsilon = \epsilon\partial + \sum_1^\infty u_{n+1}(\epsilon, T)(\epsilon\partial)^{-n};\ M_\epsilon = \sum_1^\infty nT_n L_\epsilon^{n-1} + \sum_1^\infty v_{n+1}(\epsilon, T) L_\epsilon^{-n-1} \tag{2.40}$$

with $u_{n+1}(\epsilon, T) = U_{n+1}(T) + O(\epsilon)$ and $v_{n+1}(\epsilon, T) = V_{n+1}(T) + O(\epsilon)$. Then set

$$\psi = \left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)\right] e^{\sum_1^\infty (T_n/\epsilon)\lambda^n} = exp\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}S(T, \lambda) + O(1)\right); \tag{2.41}$$

$$\tau = exp\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}F(T) + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$$

Setting $P = S_X$ with (**P25**) $\tau(T - (1/n\lambda^n))exp[\sum_1^\infty T_n\lambda^n]/\tau(T)$ one obtains

$$\lambda = P + \sum_1^\infty U_{n+1}P^{-n};\ P = \lambda - \sum_1^\infty P_i\lambda^{-i};\ \mathfrak{M} = \sum_1^\infty nT_n\lambda^{n-1} + \sum_1^\infty V_{n+1}\lambda^{-n-1} \tag{2.42}$$

along with (**P26**) $B_n = \sum_0^n b_{nm}\partial^m \to \mathfrak{B}_n = \sum_0^n b_{nm}P^m \sim \lambda_+^n$ leading to (note $\partial_n M = [B_n, M]$)

$$\partial_n\lambda = \{\mathfrak{B}_n, \lambda\};\ \partial_n\mathfrak{M} = \{\mathfrak{B}_n, \mathfrak{M}\};\ \{\lambda, \mathfrak{M}\} = 1 \tag{2.43}$$

where $\{A, B\} = \partial_P A\partial_X B - \partial_X A\partial_P B$.

Now return to [27, 56] (sketched briefly in (2.31) - (2.36)). Note $\sum_{-2}^\infty v_n(\tilde{x})\partial_x^{-n-1} = \partial + v_0\partial^{-1} + \cdots$ corresponds to **(P17)** with index changes and $v \sim u$, while $\Lambda = \sum_{-2}^\infty u_n(\tilde{x})\lambda^{-n-1}$ corresponds to $\Lambda = \lambda + u_0\lambda^{-1} + \cdots$ which corresponds to (2.42) with $\lambda \sim P$. Thus we see that the Moyal bracket in (2.35) for example involves X and P derivatives where (X, P) is the natural phase space for dKP. The connection between $(KP)_{Sato}$ and $(KP)_\kappa$ for $\lambda = 1/2$ is obtained by relating $u_n \sim U_{n+1}$ in dKP to $v_n \sim u_{n+1}$ in KP. It is important to realize here that no scaling is involved in [27, 56]. In any case one can formulate the KP hierarchy as a quantization of dKP under the Moyal bracket. The actual correspondence (2.36) is not important here (see also below) and one could simply define KP as $(KP)_\kappa$ for $\kappa = 1/2$ and express it through phase space (X, P) Moyal brackets. We will discuss below similar correspondences for q-KP and dKP under suitable q-Moyal type brackets. In this direction, following [56], one would have

$$\frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial t_n} = \{\mathfrak{B}_n, \lambda\}_\kappa;\ \mathfrak{B}_n \sim (\lambda * \cdots * \lambda)_+;\ \frac{\partial\mathfrak{B}_n}{\partial t_m} - \frac{\partial\mathfrak{B}_m}{\partial t_n} + \{\mathfrak{B}_n, \mathfrak{B}_m\}_\kappa = 0 \tag{2.44}$$

3. REMARKS ON Q-KP

There are various approaches to q-KP and we mention e.g. [3, 4, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 35, 39, 40, 54, 59, 60, 62]. We will not dwell upon q-nKdV or q-NLS here, nor upon discrete KP as in [3, 4, 15]. Let us rather follow [30, 59] at first in writing (**P27**) $Df(x) = f(xq)$ with $D_q f(x) = [f(xq) - f(s)]/x(q-1)$ and we recall

$$(a; q)_0 = 1;\ (a; q)_k = \prod_0^{k-1}(1 - aq^s);\ \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array}\right)_q = \frac{(1-q^n)(1-q^{n-1})\cdots(1-q^{n-k+1})}{(1-q)(1-q^2)\cdots(1-q^k)} \tag{3.1}$$

Then using (**P28**) $D_q^n(fg)=\sum_0^n\binom{n}{k}_q(D^{n-k}D_q^kf)D_q^{n-k}g$ one obtains a formula (**P29**) $D_q^nf=\sum_0^\infty\binom{n}{k}_q(D^{n-k}D_q^kf)D_q^{n-k}$ ($n\in\mathbf{Z}$ and this is shown to be correct via (**P30**) $D_q^m(D_q^nf)=D_q^{m+n}f$ (proved in [30]). This leads to the formal adjoint to $P=\sum a_iD_q^i$ as (**P31**) $P^*=\sum(D_q^*)^ia_i$ where $D_q^*=-(1/q)D_{1/q}$ and the result that (**P32**) $(PQ)^*=Q^*P^*$. Now consider the formal q-PSDO (**P33**) $L=D_q+a_0+\sum_1^\infty a_iD_q^{-i}$ leading to the q-deformed KP hierarchy $(\partial L/\partial t_j)=[(L^j)_+,L]$ (this differs by a factor of $x(1-q)$ from the definitions in [24]). Let S be the PSDO (**P34**) $S=1+\sum_1^\infty w_kD_q^{-k}$ satisfying $L=SD_qS^{-1}$ (whose existence is proved easily). The vector fields $\partial/\partial t_j$ can be extended via (**P35**) $(\partial S/\partial t_j)=-(L^j)_-S$ and will remain commutative. One uses now a nonstandard definition

$$exp_q(x)=\sum_0^\infty\frac{(1-q)^kx^k}{(q;q)_k}=exp\left(\sum_1^\infty\frac{(1-q)^kx^k}{k(1-q^k)}\right)\tag{3.2}$$

and $D_q^kexp_q(xz)=z^kexp_q(xz)$. One uses also the notation (**P36**) $P|_{x/t}=\sum p_i(x/t)t^iD_q^i$ when $P=\sum p_iD_q^i$. The q-wave function w_q and its adjoint w_q^* are defined via

$$w_q(x,t)=Sexp_q(xz)exp\left(\sum_1^\infty t_iz^i\right);\ w_q^*=(S^*)^{-1}|_{x/q}exp_{1/q}(-xz)exp\left(-\sum_1^\infty t_kz^k\right)\tag{3.3}$$

One can easily show (as in the classical case)

$$Lw_q=zw_q;\ \partial_mw_q=(L^m)_+w_q;\ L^*|_{x/q}w_q^*=zw_q^*;\ \partial_mw_q^*=-(L^m|_{x/q})_+^*w_q^*\tag{3.4}$$

One uses the standard notation (**P37**) $res_z(\sum a_iz^i)=a_{-1}$ and $res_{D_q}(\sum b_iD_q^i)=b_{-1}$ and proves an analogue of Dickey's lemma, namely

$$res_z(Pexp_q(xz)Q^*|_{x/q}exp_{1/q}(-xz))=res_{D_q}(PQ)\tag{3.5}$$

Further a q-bilinear identity is proved in the form (**P38**) $res_z(D_q^n\partial^\alpha w_qw_q^*)=0$; the converse is also true. In addition given formal series

$$w_q=\left(1+\sum_1^\infty w_iz^{-i}\right)exp_q(xz)exp\left(\sum_1^\infty t_iz^i\right);\tag{3.6}$$

$$w_q^*=\left(1+\sum_1^\infty w_i^*z^{-i}\right)exp_{1/q}(-xz)exp\left(-\sum_1^\infty t_iz^i\right)$$

with **(P38)** holding for any $n\in\mathbf{Z}_+$ and any multi-index α with nonnegative components α_i, then the operator $L=SD_qS^{-1}$ where $S=1+\sum w_iD_q^{-i}$ is a solution of the q-KP hierarchy with wave and adjoint wave functions given by w_q and w_q^*. As a consequence one can prove the existence of a quantum tau function. Indeed let (**P39**) $\tilde{w}_q=[exp_q(xz)]^{-1}w_q$ and $\tilde{w}_q^*=[exp_{1/q}(-xz)]^{-1}w_q^*$. A little argument shows that there is a function $\tau_q(x;t)$ such that

$$\tilde{w}_q=\frac{\tau_q(x;t-[z^{-1}])}{\tau_q(x;t)}exp\left(\sum_1^\infty t_iz^i\right);\ \tilde{w}_q^*=\frac{\tau_q(x;t+[z^{-1}])}{\tau_q(x;t)}exp\left(-\sum_1^\infty t_iz^i\right)\tag{3.7}$$

Equivalently then one can write

$$w_q = \frac{\tau_q(x;t-[z^{-1}])}{\tau_q(x;t)} exp_q(xz) exp\left(\sum_1^\infty t_i z^i\right); \tag{3.8}$$

$$w_q^* = \frac{\tau_q(x;t+[z^{-1}])}{\tau_q(x;t)} exp_{1/q}(-xz) exp\left(-\sum_1^\infty t_i z^i\right)$$

It follows that if $L_1 = \partial + \sum_1^\infty a_i\partial^{-i}$ with $\partial/\partial t_1$ is a solution of the KP hierarchy with tau function τ, then

$$\tau_q(x;t) = \tau(t+[x]_q);\ [x]_q = \left(x, \frac{(1-q)^2}{2(1-q^2)}x^2, \frac{(1-q)^3}{3(1-q^3)}x^3, \cdots,\right) \tag{3.9}$$

is a tau function for the q-KP hierarchy. Finally applications to N-qKdV are given and in particular for $L = D_q^2 + (q-1)xuD_q + u$ a solution for qKdV one has

$$u(x;t) = D_q \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} log\tau_q(x;t)\tau_q(xq;t) \tag{3.10}$$

This via $S = 1 - (\partial/\partial t_1)log\tau_q(x;t)D_q^{-1} + \cdots$ and $S^{-1} = 1 + (\partial/\partial t_1)log\tau_q(x;t)D_q^{-1} + \cdots$.

We recall also the standard symbol calculus for PSDO following e.g. [28, 47, 58]. First one recalls from [28] the ring $\mathfrak{A}$ of pseudodifferential operators (PSDO) via PSD symbols (cf. also [58] for a more mathematical discussion). Thus one looks at formal series (**P40**) $A(x,\xi) = \sum_{-\infty}^n a_i(x)\xi^i$ where ξ is the symbol for ∂_x and $a_i(x) \in \mathbf{C}^\infty$ (say on the line or circle). The multiplication law is given via the Leibnitz rule for symbols (**P41**) $A(x,\xi)\circ B(x,\xi) = \sum_{k\geq 0}(1/k!)A_\xi^k(x,\xi)B_x^{(k)}(x,\xi)$ where $A_\xi^k(x,\xi) = \sum_{-\infty}^n a_i(x)(\xi^i)^{(k)}$ and $B_x^{(k)}(x,\xi) = \sum_{-\infty}^n b_i^{(k)}(x)\xi^i$ with $b_i^{(k)}(x) = \partial_x^k b_i(x)$. This determines a Lie algebra structure on $\mathfrak{A}$ via (**P42**) $[A,B] = A\circ B - B\circ A$. Now let A be a first order formal PSDO of the form (**P43**) $A = \partial_x + \sum_{-\infty}^{-1} a_i(\tilde{x})\partial_x^i$ where $\tilde{x} \sim (x, t_2, t_3, \cdots)$. Then the KP hierarchy can be written in the form (**P44**) $(\partial A/\partial t_m) = [(A^m)_+, A]$ which is equivalent to a system of evolution equations (**P45**) $(\partial a_i/\partial t_m) = f_i$ where the f_i are certain universal differential polyomials in the a_i, homogeneous of weight $m+|i|+1$ where a_{-i}^j has weight $|i|+j+1$ for $a^j \sim \partial_x^j a$.

Somewhat more traditionally (following [58] - modulo notation and various necessary analytical details), one can write

$$Au(x) = (2\pi)^{-1}\int e^{ix\cdot\xi}a(x,\xi)\hat{u}(\xi)d\xi \tag{3.11}$$

where $\hat{u}(\xi) = \int exp(-ix\cdot\xi)u(x)dx$. One takes $D = (1/i)\partial_x$ and writes $a = symb(A)$ with $A = op(a) \sim \dot{A}$ where the $\cdot$ is to mod out $\mathfrak{S}^{-\infty}$ (we will not be fussy about this and will simply use A). The symbol of $A\circ B$ is then formally

$$(a\odot b)(x,\xi) = \sum \frac{1}{\alpha!}\partial_\xi^\alpha a(x,\xi)D_x^\alpha b(x,\xi) \tag{3.12}$$

corresponding to **(P41)**, while $[A, B] = AB - BA$ corresponds to the symbol (**P46**) $\{a, b\} = (\partial a/\partial\xi)(\partial b/\partial x) - (\partial a/\partial x)(\partial b/\partial\xi)$. One notes that $\widehat{P(D)T} = P(\xi)\hat{T}$. In any event it is clear that the algebra of differential operators on a manifold M (quantum operators) may be considered as a noncommutative deformation of the algebra of functions on T^*M defined by canonical quantization via the symplectic form $\omega = \sum dp_i \wedge dx^i$. The extension to PSDO brings one into the aena of integrable systems etc. Thus in a certain sense KP is an extension or generalization of quantum mechanics (QM) based on the ring of PSDO (PSDO of all orders arise via L_+^n in the higher flows).

In [47] for example one extends matters to q-derivatives $\partial_q f(z) = [f(qz) - f(z)]/(q-1)z$ via (**P47**) $\partial_q(fg) = \partial_q(f)g + \tau(f)\partial_q g$ where $\tau(f)(z) = f(qz)$ (note $\partial_q\tau = q\tau\partial_q$). PSDO are defined via (**P48**) $A(x, \partial_q) = \sum_{-\infty}^n u_i(x)\partial_q^i$ with $\partial_q u = (\partial_q u) + \tau(u)\partial_q$ and one has

$$\partial_q^{-1}u = \sum_{k\geq 0}(-1)^k q^{-k(k+1)/2}(\tau^{-k-1}(\partial_q^k u))\partial_q^{-k-1}; \tag{3.13}$$

$$\partial_q^n u = \sum_{k\geq 0}\left[\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array}\right]_q (\tau^{n-k}(\partial_q^k u))\partial_q^{n-k}$$

Recall here

$$(n)_q = \frac{q^n - 1}{q - 1};\ \left[\begin{array}{c} m \\ k \end{array}\right]_q = \frac{(m)_q(m-1)_q\cdots(m-k+1)_q}{(1)_q(2)_q\cdots(k)_q} \tag{3.14}$$

Then the q-analogue of the Leibnitz rule is

$$A(x, \partial_q)B(x, \partial_q) = \sum_{k\geq 0}\frac{1}{(k)_q!}\left(\frac{d^k}{d\partial_q^k}A\right) * (\partial_q^k B) \tag{3.15}$$

$$\frac{d^k}{d\partial_q^k}(f\partial_q^\alpha) = (\alpha)_q(\alpha - 1)_q\cdots(\alpha - k + 1)_q f\partial_q^{\alpha - k}$$

One also uses the rules (**P49**) $f * \partial_q = f\partial_q$, $\partial_q * f = \tau(f)\partial_q$, and $\partial_q^{-1} * f = \tau^{-1}(f)\partial_q^{-1}$. Then set $L_q = \partial_q + u_1(z) + u_2(z)\partial_q^{-1} + u_3(z)\partial_q^{-2} + \cdots$ and one has q-KP via $(\partial L_q/\partial t_m) = [L_q, (L_q^m)_+]$ where the order is different in [,] and $u_1(z)$ has a nontrivial evolution because of **(P49)**.

In accord with the procedures of [27, 56] we should now represent the ring $\mathfrak{A}_q$ of qPSDO symbols via a product as in say **(P41)** and thence provide expressions for deformation thereof. The X and P variables should come from the phase space for dKP. Evidently the qPSDO symbols will involve a variation on (3.15) (cf. (3.12)) and in view of the lovely development sketched above from [30] it should be better to phrase matters in that notation. Thus use **(P33)** where $D_q \sim \partial_q$ and from **(P28)** one has $D_q(fg) = f(qx)D_q g + (D_q f)g(x)$. Thus the rules of [47] should apply to D_q with suitable embellishment and we look at (cf. **(P29)** and **(P30)**)

$$\sum_{-\infty}^{n} a_i(x)D_q^i \sum_{-\infty}^{n} b_j(x)D_q^j = \sum_{-\infty}^{n} a_i(x)\sum_{-\infty}^{n}\sum_{0}^{\infty}\left(\begin{array}{c} i \\ k \end{array}\right)_q (D^{i-k}D_q^k b_j(x))D_q^{i+j-k} = \tag{3.16}$$

$$= \sum_{k\geq 0}\sum_{i,j} a_i(x)\left(\begin{array}{c} i\\ k\end{array}\right)_q (D^{i-k}D_q^k b_j(x))D_q^{i+j-k}$$

This amounts to ($\xi \sim D_q$)

$$\sum a_i(x)\xi^i \circ \sum b_j(x)\xi^j = \sum_{i,j,k} a_i(x)\left(\begin{array}{c} i\\ k\end{array}\right)_q (D^{i-k}D_q^k b_j(x))\xi^{i+j-k} \tag{3.17}$$

leading to

$$\{a,b\} = \sum_{k\geq 0}\sum_{i,j}\xi^{i+j-k}\left[a_i(x)\binom{i}{k}_q D^{i-k}D_q^k b_j(x) - b_j(x)\binom{j}{k}_q D^{j-k}D_q^k a_i(x)\right] \tag{3.18}$$

Another way of writing this could be based on (cf. **(P41)**)

$$\frac{1}{(k)_q!}A_\xi^k \sim \sum_i \left(\begin{array}{c} i\\ k\end{array}\right)_q a_i(x)\xi^{i-k}D^{i-k};\ B_x^{(k)} = \sum_j D_q^k b_j(x)\xi^j \tag{3.19}$$

thus as symbols

$$a\circ b \sim \sum_{k\geq 0}\frac{1}{(k)_q!}A_\xi^k B_x^{(k)};\ \{a,b\} \sim \sum_{k\geq 0}\frac{1}{(k)_q!}\left(A_\xi^k B_x^{(k)} - B_\xi^k A_x^{(k)}\right) \tag{3.20}$$

more in keeping with (3.12). In this direction one could write e.g. $\eta = \kappa^{-1}\xi$ with $\partial_\eta = \kappa\partial_\xi$ and (**P50**) $(1/(k)_q!)\partial_\eta^k A \sim (\kappa^k/(k)_q!)\partial_\xi^k A$ (cf. (3.19)). Then define (**P51**) $\{a,b\}_\kappa = \sum_{k\geq 0}(\kappa^k/(k)_q!)(A_\xi^k B_x^{(k)} - B_\xi^k A_x^{(k)})$. In any event we have shown heuristically (see Section 4 for more detail and enhancement)

PROPOSITION 3.1. The calculi of PSDO and q-PSDO correspond symbolically via $\partial \sim D_q = \partial_q$ and suitable insertion of $D \sim \tau$ factors along with q-subscripts (individual terms may differ because e.g. brackets [,] have different degrees, etc.).

We note from [14] an associative q-Weyl type star product based on ($\nu = log(q)$ and $\hbar = 0$)

$$*_W^q = exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2}\left[\overleftarrow{\partial}_x xp\overrightarrow{\partial}_p - \overleftarrow{\partial}_p px\overrightarrow{\partial}_x\right]\right) \tag{3.21}$$

which essentially corresponds to our formula (4.14) in [7], namely

$$\{f,g\}_M \sim f(xq^{-p\partial_p}, pq^{x\partial_x})g(x,p) - g(xq^{-p\partial_p}, pq^{x\partial_x})f(x,p) \tag{3.22}$$

This is however quite different from our version (2.2) (with $X_f^D g \sim \{f,g\}_M$) and it is different also from (2.3). Some obstacles to the use of a D_q version of (3.22) for a Weyl ordered q-plane with $PX - qXP = i\hbar$ are discussed in [14]. In particular the lack of a complete basis is indicated and it may be that some version of (2.3) will circumvent this problem. We note also that **(P51)** for example arising from the PSDO calculus (3.16) - (3.20) etc. is different from the associative star products suggested in [14] of the form $*_W^q$ above and ($\nu = log(q)$ and $\hbar = 0$)

$$*_S^q = exp(\nu\overleftarrow{\partial}_p px\overrightarrow{\partial}_x);\ *_A^q = exp(-\nu\overleftarrow{\partial}_x xp\overrightarrow{\partial}_p) \tag{3.23}$$

Here we apparently must identify (3.20) and **(P51)** as the algebra of qPSD symbols or operators while expressions such as (3.21) or (3.23) (and perhaps (2.2)) would correspond to q-Moyal type deformations of dKP; their relations should then be determined. We note also the (possibly nonassociative) D_q versions of $*_S^q$ and $*_A^q$ from [14] for $\hbar \neq 0$, namely (here apparently $[m] \sim (m)_q \sim (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$)

$$*_S = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{(i\hbar)^r}{(r)_q!} \overleftarrow{D}_p^r exp(\nu \overleftarrow{\partial}_p px \overrightarrow{\partial}_x) \overrightarrow{D}_x^r; \tag{3.24}$$

$$*_A = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} (-\nu \overleftarrow{\partial}_x x)^s \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-i\hbar)^r q^{r(r-1)/2}}{(r)_q!} \overleftarrow{D}_x^r \overrightarrow{D}_p^r (p \overrightarrow{\partial}_p)^s$$

We recall from [20] that standard ordering S here means $x^m p^n \to \hat{x}^m \hat{p}^n$ while antistandard A means $x^m p^n \to \hat{p}^n \hat{x}^m$. Thus we want to compare **(P51)** with (3.21), or (3.23) or (3.24) and in view of the D_q operators we probably want (3.24) or a Weyl form of this. Recall that for $\nu = log(q)$ one has $exp(\nu p \partial_p) f(p) = f(qp)$ and e.g.

$$f(pq^{-x\partial_x}) g(x) \sim \sum f_n p^n q^{-nx\partial_x} g(x) = \sum f_n p^n g(q^{-n} x) \tag{3.25}$$

Thus writing out the first equation in (3.24) for example one gets ($\mathfrak{D} = D_q$)

$$f *_S g = \sum_0^{\infty} \frac{i\hbar)^r}{(r)_q!} \mathfrak{D}_p^r f(x,p) e^{\nu \overleftarrow{\partial}_p px \overrightarrow{\partial}_x} \mathfrak{D}_x^r g(x,p) \tag{3.26}$$

Before embarking on questions of comparison à la [27, 56] let us recall some results from [21]. Here one considers star products of the form (**P52**) $f \bigstar g = fg + \sum_{n \geq 1} h^n B_n(f,g)$ where the B_n are bilinear differential operators. In particular in [21] one shows that any bracket of the form

$$\{f,g\} = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{r+s-2} \sum_{j=0}^{r} \sum_{k=0}^{s} b_{rj,sk} (\partial_x^j \partial_y^{r-j} f)(\partial_x^k \partial_y^{s-k} g) \tag{3.27}$$

may be transformed to one with $b_{00,10} = b_{00,11} = 0$ and any such bracket satisfying the Jacobi identity must be of the form

$$\{f,g\} = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^{r} \sum_{k=0}^{s} b_{rjk} (\partial_x^j \partial_y^{r-j} f)(\partial_x^k \partial_y^{r-k} g) \tag{3.28}$$

By suitable hocus pocus one shows also that (3.28) plus Jacobi is equivalent to Moyal. Note here that (3.36) below is of this form with $b_{rr0} \neq 0$, $b_{r0r} \neq 0$, and all other coefficients equal 0. Also $b_{110} = b_{101}$ (as required) and the Jacobi condition for $\{f,g\} = (1/h)(f \bigstar g - g \bigstar f)$ can be proved directly via associativity of $\bigstar$ (exercise). Thus

$$\{\{f,g\},h\} + \{\{h,f\},g\} + \{\{g,h\},f\} = 0 \tag{3.29}$$

REMARK 3.1. We recall here the argument in [56] relating KP and dKP_M. Here

$$\{f,g\}_\kappa = \sum_0^\infty \frac{(-1)^s\kappa^{2s}}{(2s+1)!}\sum_{j=0}^{2s+1}(-1)^j\binom{2s+1}{j}(\partial_x^j\partial_p^{2s-j+1}f)(\partial_x^{2s-j+1}\partial_p^j g) \tag{3.30}$$

gives an expression for dKP_M. ■

In order to establish an equivalence to the KP hierarchy, based on PSDO of the form

$$\partial_n L = [(L^n)_+, L];\ L = \partial + \sum_2^\infty v_n(x,t_i)\partial^{-n} \tag{3.31}$$

one looks at

$$\partial_n\lambda = \{(\mathfrak{L}^n)_+, \mathfrak{L}\};\ \mathfrak{L} = p + \sum_2^\infty u_n(x,t_i)p^{-n+1} \tag{3.32}$$

and compares (3.30) with a bracket allegedly based on PSDO of the form (cf. [56])

$$\{f,g\}'_\kappa = \sum_0^\infty \frac{\kappa^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!}\left[\partial_\xi^{2n+1}f\partial_x^{2n+1}g - \partial_\xi^{2n+1}g\partial_x^{2n+1}f\right] \tag{3.33}$$

Note here from **(P41)**, (3.11), etc. (**P53**) $A\circ B = \sum(1/k!)\partial_\xi^k A(x,\xi)\partial_x^k B(x,\xi)$ so (cf. **(P41)** and [5])

$$A\circ_\kappa B = Ae^{\kappa\overleftarrow{\partial}_\xi\overrightarrow{\partial}_x}B = \sum\frac{\kappa^n}{n!}\partial_\xi^n A\partial_x^n B \tag{3.34}$$

and the bracket based on this is not obviously the same as (3.33) or equivalent. Note also

$$A\circ_\kappa B = A(x,\xi+\kappa\partial_x)B(x,\xi);\ B\circ_\kappa A = B(x,\xi+\kappa\partial_x)A(x,\xi) \tag{3.35}$$

We see however that (**P54**) $(1/\kappa)A\circ_\kappa B - B\circ_\kappa A) = \{A,B\}_\kappa$ is of the form (3.28) with $b_{rr0}\neq 0$, $b_{r0r}\neq 0$, and all other coefficients equal 0. Also $b_{110} = -b_{101}$ and the Jacobi identity will follow from associativity so in fact a bracket such as **(P54)** is equivalent to Moyal in the symbols involved. Note here that associativity is not obvious however (although asserted in [38, 46]) and (3.36) below was only asserted to be associative in [43] (not proved). Let us clarify this since it is not entirely trivial. Thus consider (3.34) along with e.g. (more on this below - cf. Remark 3.3)

$$f\bigstar g = fg + \sum_{n\geq 1}\frac{(-h)^n}{n!}p^n\partial_p^n f x^n\partial_x^n g \sim [q^{-x'\partial_{x'}p\partial_p}f(x,p)g(x',p')]|_{x,p} \tag{3.36}$$

while (**P55**) $A\circ_\kappa B \sim e^{\kappa\partial_{xi}\partial_{x'}}A(x,\xi)B(\xi',x')$ ($x'\to x$, $\xi'\to\xi$). In fact associativity for $A\circ_\kappa B$ is proved in [42] (note the κ can be absorbed in ξ by rescaling). The trick is to use the formula

$$(a\xi^n)(b\xi^r) = a\sum_{k\geq 0}\binom{n}{k}\partial_x^k b\xi^{n-k+r} \tag{3.37}$$

which shows that (for $\kappa = 1$)

$$A \circ_\kappa B = \sum \frac{1}{m!}\partial_\xi^m A \partial_x^n B = \tag{3.38}$$

$$= \sum \frac{1}{m!} \sum a_n n(n-1)\cdots(n-m+1)\xi^{n-m} \cdot \sum b_j^{(m)} \xi^j = \sum a_n \binom{n}{m} b_j^{(m)} \xi^{n-m+j}$$

Now for associativity one checks that (**P56**) $[\xi^n(a\xi^r)]b = \xi^n[(a\xi^n)b]$. Thus the left side of **(P56)** is

$$\left[\sum_{\gamma\geq 0}\binom{n}{\gamma} a^{(\gamma)}\xi^{n+r-\gamma}\right] b = \sum_{\gamma,\mu\geq 0} a^{(\gamma)}b^{(\mu)}\binom{n}{\gamma}\binom{n+r-\gamma}{\mu}\xi^{n+r-\gamma-\mu} \tag{3.39}$$

and the right side of **(P56)** is

$$\xi^n\left[a\sum_{\gamma\geq 0}\binom{r}{\alpha} b^{(\alpha)}\xi^{r-\alpha}\right] = \sum_{\alpha,\beta\geq 0}(ab^{(\alpha)})^{(\beta)}\binom{n}{\beta}\binom{r}{\alpha}\xi^{n+r-\alpha-\beta} = \tag{3.40}$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma\geq 0} a^{(\alpha)}b^{(\beta+\alpha-\gamma)}\binom{\beta}{\gamma}\binom{n}{\beta}\binom{r}{\alpha}\xi^{n+r-\alpha-\beta}$$

For **(P56)** one needs then ($n, r \in \mathbf{Z},\ \gamma,\mu \in \mathbf{Z}_+$)

$$\binom{n}{\gamma}\binom{n+r-\gamma}{\mu} = \sum_{\alpha+\beta=\gamma+\mu,\ \alpha,\beta>0}\binom{\beta}{\gamma}\binom{n}{\beta}\binom{r}{\alpha} \tag{3.41}$$

To prove (3.41) one can start with

$$\gamma!\binom{n}{\gamma}(1+x)^{n-\gamma}(1+y)^r|_{y=x} = \left[\frac{1}{\gamma!}\partial_x^\gamma(1+x)^n(1+y)^r\right]\Big|_{y=x} \tag{3.42}$$

and picking out the coefficients of x^μ on both sides gives

$$\binom{n}{\gamma}\binom{n+r-\gamma}{\mu} = \frac{1}{\gamma!}\left[x^\mu - coeff\left\{\frac{1}{\gamma!}\partial_x^\gamma\sum\binom{n}{\beta}x^\beta\binom{r}{\alpha}y^\alpha\right\}_{y=x}\right] = \tag{3.43}$$

$$= x^\mu - coeff\left\{\binom{\beta}{\gamma}\sum\binom{n}{\beta}\binom{r}{\alpha}x^{\beta-\gamma}x^\alpha\right\} = \sum_{\alpha+\beta=\gamma+\mu}\binom{\beta}{\gamma}\binom{n}{\beta}\binom{r}{\alpha}$$

(cf. also [44]). Associativity for $\bigstar$ conceivably follows along similar lines.

REMARK 3.2. Thus, although the origin of (3.33) is unclear, it is sufficient to work from the original PSDO bracket (3.34) and use [21] to assert that all of these brackets are equivalent to Moyal (equivalent means up to a change of variables). A specific correspondence as in [27] is not needed then to assert indirectly that q-KP is equivalent to dKP_M as in (3.36) once it is clear that q-KP corresponds to KP. ■

REMARK 3.3. The form (3.36) comes from a q-plane construction as in [43] (cf. also [61] and Remark 3.5). Thus one writes (**P57**) $\hat{x}\hat{p} = q\hat{p}\hat{x}$ and $\mathfrak{A}_x = \mathbf{C}[\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2]/\mathfrak{R}$ where

$\mathfrak{R} \sim$ (**P57**). We recall that if $x^i \sim \hat{x}^i$ are corresponding commuting variables (corresponding e.g. to some ordering and isomorphism as in [6, 7, 13, 51]); then using a Fourier transform

$$\tilde{f}(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2x e^{-ik_jx^j} f(x) \tag{3.44}$$

a unique operator

$$W(f) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2k e^{ik_j\hat{x}^j}\tilde{f}(k) \tag{3.45}$$

replaces x^i by $\hat{x}^i$ in the most symmetric manner (Weyl quantization). If the $\hat{x}^i$ have Hermitian properties then $W(f)$ will inherit them for real f. Operators defined by (3.45) can be multiplied and one wants to associate them with classical functions. If such a function exists we call it $f\bigstar g$ defined via (**P58**) $W(f)W(g) = W(f\bigstar g)$ or more explicitly

$$W(f)W(g) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2}\int d^2kd^2\ell e^{ik_i\hat{x}^i}e^{i\ell_j\hat{x}^j}\tilde{f}(k)\tilde{g}(\ell) \tag{3.46}$$

If the product of exponents can be defined via the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff (BCH) formula then $f\bigstar g$ will exist. This is the case for a canonical structure (**P59**) $exp(ik_i\hat{x}^i)exp(i\ell_j\hat{x}^j) = exp(i(k_j+\ell_j)\hat{x}^j - (i/2)k_i\ell_j\theta^{ij})$. In fact one can compute $(f\bigstar g)(x)$ from (3.46) and **(P59)** by replacing $\hat{x}$ with x, i.e.

$$f\bigstar g = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2}\int d^2kd^2\ell e^{(ik_j+\ell_j)x^j-(1/2)k_i\theta^{ij}\ell_j}\tilde{f}(k)\tilde{g}(\ell) = \tag{3.47}$$

$$= e^{(1/2)\partial_{x^i}\theta^{ij}\partial_{y^j}}f(x)g(y)|_{y\to x}$$

which is the Moyal product. For the q-plane the BCH formula cannot be used explicitly and the Weyl quantization (3.45) does not seem to be the most natural one (cf. [14]). For now, in terms of algebraic structure only, any unique prescription of an operator with a function of classical variables will suffice. This could be e.g. normal order where $\hat{x}$ operators are placed to the left of $\hat{y}$ operators (or better here $\hat{x}^m\hat{p}^n$ corresponds to $\hat{x}\hat{p}$ order). Thus define (**P60**) $W(f(x,p)) =: f(\hat{x},\hat{p})$: and **(P58)** becomes (**P61**) $: f(\hat{x},\hat{p}) :: g(\hat{x},\hat{p}) :=: (f\bigstar g)(\hat{x},\hat{p}) :$ which for monomials is

$$\hat{x}^m\hat{p}^n\hat{x}^a\hat{p}^b = q^{-na}\hat{x}^{m+n}\hat{p}^{a+b};\ :\hat{x}^n\hat{p}^n :: \hat{x}^a\hat{p}^b := q^{-na} : \hat{x}^{m+n}\hat{p}^{a+b} := \tag{3.48}$$

$$= W\left(q^{-x'\partial_{x'}p\partial_p}x^mp^n{x'}^a{p'}^b\Big|_{x'\to x;\,p'\to p}\right)$$

This generalizes for power series to

$$f\bigstar g = q^{-x'\partial_{x'}p\partial_p}f(x,p)g(x',p')|_{x'\to x;\,p'\to p} \tag{3.49}$$

which is (3.36). One could equally well have used $\hat{p}\hat{x}$ ordering or Weyl ordering here. For mononomials of fixed degree the $\hat{x}\hat{p}$, or $\hat{p}\hat{x}$, or Weyl ordered products form a basis. We recall for $f = \sum f_{mn}x^mp^n$

$$: f(\hat{x},\hat{p}) :_W = \sum\frac{f_{mn}}{2^m}\sum_0^m\binom{m}{\ell}\hat{x}^{m-\ell}\hat{p}^n\hat{x}^\ell \tag{3.50}$$

For the q-plane the form **(P58)** provides a formula (**P62**) $W(x^ix^j) =: \hat{x}^i\hat{x}^j :$ (with say $\hat{x}\hat{p}$ ordering) and leads to

$$f\bigstar g = fg + \sum_{n\geq 1}\frac{1}{n!}(-h)^n(p\partial_p)^n f(x\partial_x)^b \tag{3.51}$$

which is (3.36). Note for f, g of the form $f = \sum f_{mn}x^mp^n$ with $m \geq 0$ and $-\infty < n \leq N$ (3.36) or (3.51) will have the same form. For this, working with $\hat{x}\hat{p}$ ordering, we recall $\hat{x}^m\hat{p}^n\hat{x}^a\hat{p}^b = q^{-na}\hat{x}^{m+a}\hat{p}^{n+b}$ and if $n = -\eta$ we get $q^{\eta a}$ as a multiplier. This is consistent with moving $p^{-\eta}$ past x^a with $p^{-1}x = qxp^{-1}$ (from $xp = qpx$). Hence the formulas (3.48), (3.49), and (3.51) remain valid. ■

In addition to the constructions for q-KP in (3.1) - (3.9) we mention here the Frenkel (F) and Khesin-Lyubashenko-Roger (KLR) versions of q-KP (cf. [24, 36]). Thus write $(t = (t_1, t_2, \cdots),\ t_1 \sim x)$

$$Q = D + a_0(t)D^0 + a_{-1}(t)D^{-1} + \cdots;\ Q_q = D_1 + b_0(t)D_q^0 + b_{-1}(t)D_q^{-1} + \cdots \tag{3.52}$$

where $Df(x) = f(qx)$ and $D_qf(x) = [f(qx) - f(x)]/(q-1)x$. The F and KLR hierarchies are defined via

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial t_n} = [(Q^n)_+, Q]\ (F);\ \frac{\partial Q_q}{\partial t_n} = [(Q_q^n)_+, Q_q]\ (KLR) \tag{3.53}$$

and there is an isomorphism (**P63**) $\hat{}: \mathfrak{D}_q \to \mathfrak{D}$ mapping the F or KLR systems into the discrete KP hierarchy (cf. [3, 4, 15] - we omit here a discussion of discrete KP). These systems are equivalent by virtue of a correspondence

$$a_i(y) = \sum_{0\leq k\leq n-i}\frac{\begin{bmatrix} k+i \\ k\end{bmatrix}}{(-y(q-1)q^i)^k}b_{k+i}(y) \tag{3.54}$$

Consider now a suitable space of functions $f(x)$ represented by "Fourier" series (**P64**) $f(x) = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_n\phi_n(x)$ for $\phi_n(x) = \delta(q^{-n}y^{-1}x)$ for $q \neq 1$ and $y \in \mathbf{R}$. Set $\lambda_i = D^i\lambda_0 = \lambda(yq^i)$; then the Fourier transform $f \to \mathfrak{F}f = (\cdots, f_n, \cdots)_{n\in\mathbf{Z}}$ induces an algebra isomorphism $\hat{}: \mathfrak{D}_q \to \mathfrak{D}$ via

$$\sum a_i(y)D^i \to \sum \hat{a}_i\Lambda^i = \sum diag(\cdots, a_i(xq^n), \cdots)_{n\in\mathbf{Z}}\Lambda^i \tag{3.55}$$

where $\Lambda \sim (\delta_{i,j-1})_{i,j\in\mathbf{Z}}$ is a shift operator. In addition

$$\sum_0^n b_i(y)D_q^i = \sum_0^n a_i(y)(-\lambda D)^i \to \epsilon\left(\sum_0^n \hat{a}_i\Lambda^i\right)\epsilon^{-1} \tag{3.56}$$

where

$$\epsilon = diag\left(\cdots, \lambda_{-2}\lambda_{-1}, -\lambda_{-1}, 1, -\frac{1}{\lambda_0}, \frac{1}{\lambda_0\lambda_1}, -\frac{1}{\lambda_0\lambda_1\lambda_2}, \cdots\right);\ \epsilon_0 = 1 \tag{3.57}$$

In any event we have seen that the calculation of PSDO symbolically corresponds symbolically to qPSDO (Proposition 3.1). Further from [21] we have seen that all Moyal brackets based on an associative star product of the form **(P52)** are equivalent. Consequently one has heuristically (cf. also Section 4)

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Given the associativity of (3.36) asserted in [43] it yields a Moyal bracket equivalent to the standard one; this applies also to the associative star products (3.21) and (3.23) and to (2.3) provided it is associative. Hence dKP_M based on any such star product is equivalent to KP via [27, 56] and thence to qKP symbolically as in Proposition 3.1 (embellished as in Proposition 4.1). The fact that q-plane structure led to (3.36) is immaterial here given its associativity.*

This seems reasonable since knowing that KP is a "quantization" of dKP under a suitable Moyal bracket (and hence a generalized quantum theory) one would expect the isomorphic theory qKP to be some kind of quantization of dKP_M under equivalent Moyal brackets as indicated (cf. Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 4.1 for the correspondence $KP \leftrightarrow qKP$). Explicit examples of comparisons as in [27, 56] would be useful (cf. Remark 3.4).

REMARK 3.4. For a start in this direction explicit calculations to compare e.g. qKP and $dKP_{\bigstar}$ can be carried out using the compatibility conditions (**P65**) $D_xp = q^{-1}pD_x$ and $D_px = qxD_p$ on the q-plane ($D \sim D_q$). This can be confirmed as follows. From [37] one has

$$D_q(f(x)g(x)) = g(x)D_qf(x) + f(qx)D_qg(x) \tag{3.58}$$

Next note, in analogy to the formula from [37] (based on (3.64), (3.65), etc.)

$$\partial_i^q(f_N(x_N)\cdots f_1(x_1)) = f_N(qx_N)\cdots f_{i+1}(qx_{i+1})D_{q^2}f_i(x_i)f_{i-1}(x_{i-1})\cdots f_1(x_1) \tag{3.59}$$

we have e.g.

$$D_p(f(x)g(p)) = \frac{p^{-1}}{q-1}f(x)[g(qp) - g(p)] \tag{3.60}$$

Now $xp = qpx$ so $p^{-1}x = qxp^{-1}$ and $p^{-1}x^m = q^mx^mp^{-1}$ leading to

$$D_p(f(x)g(p)) = f(qx)\left[\frac{g(qp) - g(p)}{p(q-1)}\right] = f(qx)D_pg(p) \tag{3.61}$$

Similarly (**P66**) $D_x(f(x)g(p)) = (D_qf(x))g(p)$ and we ask what this means for xD_p and pD_x. From (3.61) one has (**P67**) $D_pf(x) = f(qx)D_p$ so $D_px = qxD_p$. As in (3.61) we look at $D_x(g(p)f(x))$ and note that $p^{-1}x = qx^{-1}p$ or $x^{-1}p = q^{-1}px^{-1}$ which means that $x^{-1}p^n = q^{-n}p^nx^{-1}$ so

$$D_x(g(p)f(x)) = g(q^{-1}p)\left[\frac{f(qx) - f(x)}{x(q-1)}\right] = g(q^{-1}p)D_xf(x) \tag{3.62}$$

Consequently (**P68**) $D_xg(p) = g(q^{-1}p)D_x$ and $D_xp = q^{-1}pD_x$ in agreement with **(P65)**. For the calculations one starts with (**P69**) $\lambda = \mathfrak{L} = p + a_0 + \sum_1^\infty a_ip^{-i}$; $\lambda_+^2 = \mathfrak{L}_+^2 = p^2 + u_1p + u_0$ where $a_i = a_i(x,t)$ and $u_i = u_i(x,t)$ with e.g. $\lambda^2 \sim \lambda\bigstar\lambda$. One computes e.g. $\partial_1\lambda = \{\lambda_+^2, \lambda\}_{\bigstar} = \lambda_+^2\bigstar\lambda - \lambda\bigstar\lambda_+^2$ and compares with $\partial_2L = [L_+^2, L]$ based on $L = D_q = a_0 + \sum a_iD_q^{-i}$ and $L_+^2 = D_q^2 + u_1D_q + u_0$. Under certain conditions (a_0, a_1, u_0, u_1 constant in x) compatible equations seem to appear, modulo solution of second order difference equations

$$(D_q^2+2c_1D_q+c_2)a_n=2c_1(c_1+a_2+\cdots+a_{n-1})\ \ (n\geq 2) \tag{3.63}$$

(cf. [13]). ■

REMARK 3.5. We note here in passing another way of dealing with q-plane differential operators following [51] (cf. also [6, 7, 13]). Thus one imbues the q-plane or Manin plane (cf. [45]) with the natural associated covariant calculus (cf. (3.64) - (3.65) below). Thus we can treat the phase space as a q-plane $x^1=x$ and $x^2=p$ for say $GL_q(2)$ with rules ($q\sim exp(\hbar)$)

$$xp=qpx;\ \partial_ix^j=qx^j\partial_i\ (i\neq j);\ \partial_ix^i=1+q^2x^i\partial_i+q\lambda\sum_{j>i}x^j\partial_j \tag{3.64}$$

where $\lambda=q-q^{-1}$. Thus

$$\partial_xx=1+q^2x\partial_x+(q^2-1)p\partial_p;\ \partial_pp=1+q^2p\partial_p;\ \partial_xp=qp\partial_x;\ \partial_px=qx\partial_p \tag{3.65}$$

Note here for example

$$\begin{gathered}\partial_pxp=qx\partial_pp=qx(1+q^2p\partial_p)=qx+q^3xp\partial_p;\\ \partial_pxp=\partial_pqpx=q(1+q^2p\partial_p)x=qx+q^3xp\partial_p\end{gathered} \tag{3.66}$$

but a situation $p\sim\partial_x$ with $px-qxp=i\hbar$ is excluded (cf. [14]). One denotes by $Diff_{q^2}(1)$ the ring generated by x,∂^q obeying (**P70**) $\partial^qx=1+q^2x\partial^q$ with $\partial^qf(x)=[f(q^2x)-f(x)]/(q^2-1)x=D_{q^2}f(x)$. We distinguish now scrupulously between $\partial^q\sim D_{q^2}$, D_q, and ∂_x,∂_p as normal q-derivatives. Introduce (**P71**) $\mu_k=1+q\lambda\sum_{j\geq k}x^j\partial_j$ so the last equation in (3.64) takes the form (**P72**) $\partial_ix^i=\mu_i+x^i\partial_i$ (note the μ_i are operators). Now there results

$$\begin{gathered}\mu_ix^j=x^j\mu_i\ (i>j)\ \mu_ix^j=q^2x^j\mu_i\ (i\leq j);\\ \mu_i\partial_i=\partial_j\mu_i\ (i>j)\ \mu_i\partial_j=q^{-2}\partial_j\mu_i\ (i\leq j)\end{gathered} \tag{3.67}$$

which implies (**P73**) $\mu_i\mu_j=\mu_j\mu_i$. Next define (**P74**) $X^i=(\mu_i)^{-1/2}x^i$ and $D_i=q(\mu_i)^{-1/2}\partial_i$ from which follows

$$X^iX^j=X^jX^i;\ D_iD_j=D_jD_i;\ D_iX^j=X^jD_i\ (i\neq j);\ D_jX^j=1+q^{-2}X^jD_j \tag{3.68}$$

Thus the relations in (3.64) are completely untangled. The D_j correspond to $D_{q^{-2}}$ and evidently $Diff_{q^2}(1)$ is isomorphic to $Diff_{q^{-2}}(1)$ since, for $\delta^q=q\mu^{-1/2}\partial^q$ and $y=\mu^{-1/2}x$ with operators x,∂^q satisfying **(P70)**, one has $\delta^qy=1+q^{-2}y\delta^q$. Further the ring isomorphism between $Diff_{q^2}(1)$ (generated by (x,∂^q) and $Diff(1)$ (generated by (x,∂) can be established via e.g. (**P75**) $\partial^q=(exp(2\hbar x\partial)-1)/x(q^2-1)$ (cf. **(P70)**). Thus $exp(2\hbar x\partial)-1=x(q^2-1)\partial^q$ or $2\hbar x\partial=log[1+x(q^2-1)\partial^q]$. Since the ring properties are not immediate from this one can go to an alternative noncanonical isomorphism as follows (cf. [51]). Let x_c^i be classical commuting variables (here $x_c^1\sim x$ and $x_c^2\sim p$). Now choose some ordering of the nonclassical x^i (e.g. Weyl ordering, or xp ordering, or px ordering). Then any polynomial $P(x)$ can be written in ordered form and replacing x^i by x_c^i one gets a polynomial symbol $\sigma(P)$ of classical variables x_c^i. This determines a symbol map $\sigma:\mathbf{C}[x^i]\to\mathbf{C}[x_c^i]$ which is a noncanonical isomorphism (dependent on the choice of ordering) between polynomial rings. Then for any polynomial $\phi(x_c^i)$ and any q-differential operator D one writes (**P76**) $\hat{D}\phi = \sigma(D(\sigma^{-1}(\phi)))$, i.e. $\hat{D}$ is the composition

$$\mathbf{C}[x_c^i] \xrightarrow{\sigma^{-1}} \mathbf{C}[x^i] \xrightarrow{D} \mathbf{C}[x^i] \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathbf{C}[x_c^i] \tag{3.69}$$

This provides a ring isomorphism of q-differential operators and classical differential operators, the latter corresponding to polynomials in $(x, p, \partial_x, \partial_p)$ with relations $\partial_x x = x\partial_x + 1$, $\partial_p p = p\partial_p + 1$, $x\partial_p = \partial_p x$, and $p\partial_x = \partial_x p$. The explicit formulas will depend on the ordering and are determined by $\hat{\partial}_i$ and $\hat{x}^i$. Note (**P77**) $\widehat{D_1D_2} = \hat{D}_1\hat{D}_2$ since the $\hat{D}_i : \mathbf{C}[x_c^i] \to \mathbf{C}[x_c^i]$ compose multiplicatively along with the $D_i : \mathbf{C}[x^i] \to \mathbf{C}[x^i]$ under the given ordering. To see this note from $\hat{D}_2\phi = \sigma(D_2(\sigma^{-1}(\phi)))$ results

$$\hat{D}_1(\hat{D}_2\phi) = \sigma(D_1(\sigma^{-1}(\sigma(D_2(\sigma^{-1}(\phi)))))) = \sigma(D_1D_2(\sigma^{-1}(\phi))) \tag{3.70}$$

As for orderings, matters are clear for xp or px ordering and hence will also hold for the completely symmetric Weyl ordering

$$x^np^m \sim \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_0^n \binom{n}{\ell}\tilde{x}^{n-\ell}\tilde{p}^m\tilde{x}^\ell \tag{3.71}$$

(cf. [5]). ■

4. DISCRETIZATION AND QUANTUM MECHANICS.

We go back to earlier comments in Section 3 (after (3.12)) which present KP as some sort of extension of QM related via Moyal to a phase space (X, P) and corresponding to dispersionless operators for dKP. The formation of q-KP and various q-Moyal brackets for dKP are present via Proposition 3.2 (in a somewhat dismissive manner) and we want to examine this further. Thus first look at QM and a q-QM obtained by replacing differential operators in ∂_i by q-difference operators using ∂_i^q for example. Take a 1-dimensional situation with $x, p \sim \partial_x$ as basic and recall from (3.13) that $\partial_q u = (\partial_q u) + \tau u\partial_q$ so the commutator relation $[\partial_x, x] = 1$ goes int (**P78**) $[\partial_q, x] = \partial_q x - x\partial_q = \partial_q x + (\tau x)\partial_q - x\partial_q = 1 + qx\partial_q - x\partial_q = 1 + (q-1)x\partial_q = 1 + (\tau - 1) = \tau$. More generally one has Leibnitz formulas (cf. (3.13))

$$\partial^n u = \sum_{k\geq 0}\binom{n}{k}\partial^k u\partial^{n-k} \longrightarrow \partial_q^n u = \sum_{k\geq 0}\binom{n}{k}_q \tau^{n-k}(\partial_q^k u)\partial_q^{n-k} \tag{4.1}$$

so e.g. (**P79**) $\partial^2 u = (\partial^2 u) + 2\partial u\partial + u\partial^2 \to \tau^2 u\partial_q^2 + (1+q)\tau\partial_q u\partial_q + u\partial_q^2$. Recall here

$$\binom{n}{k}_q = \frac{(q;q)_n}{(q;q)_k(q;q)_{n-k}};\ (q;q)_0 = 1;\ (q;q)_k = \prod_1^k(1-q^j) \tag{4.2}$$

Given that the algebra of differential operators $\mathcal{A}$ represents QM one can define any isomorphic object or "corresponding" object to also be a quantum theory (QT). Thus the correspondence $\partial\leftrightarrow\partial_q:\ \mathcal{A}\leftrightarrow\mathcal{A}_q$ with Leibnitz rules as in (4.1) leads to an algebra isomorphism. Indeed we can simplify here the formulas (3.16) - (3.20) via the symbol notation

$$\sum_0^n a_i(x)D_q^i\sum b_j(x)D_q^j=\sum_{i=0}^n a_i(x)\sum_{j=0}^n\sum_{k=0}^i\binom{i}{k}_q\tau^{i-k}D_q^kb_j(x)D_q^{i-k+j}\tag{4.3}$$

whereas

$$\sum_0^n a_i\partial^i\sum_0^n b_j\partial^j=\sum_{i=0}^n a_i(x)\sum_{k=0}^i\binom{i}{k}\partial^kb_j(x)\partial^{i-k+j}\tag{4.4}$$

Thus in symbol form ($\partial\sim\xi$)

$$\sum a_i\xi^i\circ\sum b_j\xi^j=\sum_{i,j,k}\frac{i(i-1)\cdots(i-k+1)}{k!}a_i\xi^{i-k}\partial_x^kb_j(x)\xi^j=\tag{4.5}$$

$$=\sum\binom{i}{k}\partial_\xi\xi^ia_i\partial_x^kb_j\xi^j=\sum_{k=0}\frac{1}{k!}\partial_\xi^ka(x,\xi)\partial_x^kb(x,\xi)$$

and for $D_q\sim\xi$ (as in (3.17) - (3.20)) one takes $\partial_\xi\sim(\partial/\partial\xi)_q$ to produce

$$\sum a_i\xi^i\circ\sum b_j\xi^j=\sum_{k=0}^n\frac{1}{k_q!}\partial_\xi^ka\partial_q^kb;\tag{4.6}$$

$$\frac{1}{k_q!}\partial_\xi^ka=\sum_i a_i\sum_{k=0}^i\binom{i}{k}_q\xi^{i-k}\tau^{i-k}=\sum_i a_i\sum_{k=0}^i\frac{1}{k_q!}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi}\right)_q^k\xi^i\tau^{i-k}$$

since $[i_q\cdots(i-k+1)_q/k_q!]=\binom{i}{k}_q$. Now any product of two symbols has the form $a\circ b$ as in (4.5) and one wants to check uniqueness. Thus suppose

$$L=\sum_{k=0}^n\frac{1}{k!}\partial_\xi^ka\partial_x^kb=\sum_{m=1}^n\frac{1}{m!}\partial_\xi^m\hat{a}\partial_x^m\hat{b}=R\tag{4.7}$$

We note that $\partial L/\partial b_0=a$ and $\partial R/\partial\hat{b}_0=\hat{a}$ so if we stipulate that $\hat{b}_0=b_0$ then $a=\hat{a}$ (note that b_0 only appears undifferentiated in the term $\partial_\xi^0a\partial_x^0b=a(\sum_0^nb_i\xi^i)$ and in any event $\partial(\partial^nb_0)/\partial b_0=\partial^n(1)=0$). Once we have $a=\hat{a}$ then one can equate coefficients of ∂_ξ^ka and $\partial_\xi^k\hat{a}$ (taking $m=k$) to get $\partial_x^kb=\partial_x^k\hat{b}$ which will yield $b=\hat{b}$ (for analytic $b,\hat{b}$). Similar comments apply to (4.6) and consequently for $b,\hat{b}$ with equal b_0 we can look at $\mathcal{A}\leftrightarrow\mathcal{A}_q$ as an algebra map with $a\circ b\leftrightarrow a_q\circ b_q\sim(a\circ b)_q$ where powers of τ must be inserted correctly (e.g. one could define here (**P80**) $(\partial_\xi)_q^k\xi^i=i_q\cdots(i-k+1)_q(\tau\xi)^{i-k}$). On the other hand, if $b_0\neq\hat{b}_0$ set $\tilde{b}_0=\hat{b}_0+(b_0-\hat{b}_0)$ so that $L=\hat{R}\to L=\tilde{R}-\sum(1/m!)\partial_\xi^m\hat{a}\partial_x^m(b_0-\hat{b}_0)$ and $\tilde{R}$ involves the same $\tilde{b}_0=b_0$. Then $\partial L/\partial b_0=a=\partial\tilde{R}/\partial b_0-\hat{a}=\hat{a}-\hat{a}=0$. this says $L=R$ is possible for nontrivial a only when $b_0=\hat{b}_0$. Thus $a_q\circ b_q$ can be written as in (4.6) with ∂_ξ taken as a q-derivative **(P80)** in $\mathcal{A}_q$.

Next we want to extend such arguments to the rings $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{A}_q$ of PSDO and qPSDO as in (3.11) - (3.20). We can try the same procedure with

$$L=\sum_{k\geq 0}\frac{1}{k!}A^k_\xi(x,\xi)\partial_x^k B(x,\xi)=\sum_{k\geq 0}\frac{1}{k!}\hat{A}^k_\xi(x,\xi)\partial_x^k\hat{B}(x,\xi)=R \tag{4.8}$$

where $A^k_\xi=\sum_{-\infty}^n a_i(x)\partial_\xi^k\xi^i$ and $\partial_x^kB(x,\xi)=\sum_{-\infty}^n\partial_x^k b_j(x)\xi^j$. The same reasoning applies for $b=\hat{b}_0$ producing $A=\hat{A}$ and $b_0\neq\hat{b}_0$ implies $A=0$. For the q-derivatives one modifies again the form of $(\partial_\xi)_q^k$ as in **(P80)** to obtain a ring isomorphism $\mathfrak{A}\leftrightarrow\mathfrak{A}_q$. Hence Proposition 3.1 can be improved in the form

PROPOSITION 4.1. The correspondence $\mathfrak{A}\leftrightarrow\mathfrak{A}_q$ of Proposition 3.1 can be viewed as a ring isomorphism and thus one can claim that e.g. q-KP is a generalized QT.

REMARK 4.1. One must be careful in relating discretization and quantization (cf. [5] for extensive comments on this). For example the Moyal bracket can be obtained by taking a continuous limit of a discrete dynamical bracket but discretization of the Moyal bracket does not lead back to the discrete situation (cf. [5, 26]). ■

REMARK 4.2. One can think of KP as an extended or generalized QT in two ways. The first way involving x, ∂_x has already been indicated but one can equally well look at z, ∂_z or L, M (cf. [18, 19]). This seems to be related to the development of [31, 32, 33, 34] indicated in Section 2, and a logical background is the idea of z-operators and the action on the Grassmannian as in [18, 19] (cf. also [50, 55]). We give here a little background. Thus one writes z-operators in the form (**P81**) $G=G(\partial_z,z)=\sum_{j\geq 0,i\leq i_0}a_{ij}z^i\partial_z^j$ acting on formal power series $f(z)=\sum_{-\infty}^{\infty}f_kz^k$ on the unit circle S^1 (convergence is not considered here). Operators (**P82**) $G=1+\sum_{j\geq 0,i<0}a_{ij}z^i\partial_z^j$ are called monic. To any z-operator one assigns a PSDO (**P83**) ${}^TG(x,\partial)=\sum a_{ij}x^j\partial^i$ where T means $z\to\partial$ with $\partial_z\to x$ and the factors in reverse order. Evidently

$$f\cdot g\to {}^Tg\cdot{}^Tf;\ [z,\partial_z]=[x,\partial]=-1; \tag{4.9}$$

$$G(\partial_z,z)e^{xz}={}^TG(x,\partial)e^{xz}=G(x,z)e^{xz}={}^TG(x,z)e^{xz}$$

In particular this is an anti-isomorphism PSDO $\leftrightarrow$ z-operators. One recalls that the Grassmanian Gr consists of linear subspaces $V\subset H$ ($H\sim\{f(z),\,z\in S^1\}$) such that the natural projection $V\to H_+$ is 1-1. It is then well known (cf. [8, 50, 55]) that $V\in Gr\Rightarrow$ there exists a monic z-operator G such that $V=GH_+$ and if a z-operator preserves H_+ then it involves only nonnegative powers of z. Let now $t^*=(t_2,t_3,\cdots)$ and $\xi^*=\sum_2^\infty t_kz^k$. Then $V\in Gr\to Vexp(-\xi^*(t^*,z))\in Gr$ so there is a monic z-operator $W(t^*,\partial_z,z)$ such that (**P84**) $exp(-\xi^*)V=W(t^*,\partial_z,z)H_+$. Then as above (**P85**) $W(t^*,\partial_z,z)exp(xz)=W(t^*,x,\partial)exp(xz)=W(t^*,x,z)exp(xz)$. Hence $W(t^*,x,z)exp(xz)=W(t^*,\partial_z,z)exp(xz)\in Vexp(-\xi(t^*,z))$ and $W(t^*,x,z)exp(\xi(t,z))\in V$ $(\xi(t,z)=xz+\xi(t^*,z))$. This means (**P86**) $\psi_V(t,z)=W(t^*,x,z)exp(\xi(t,z))$ is the Baker-Akhiezer (BA) function of the KP hierarchy based on $L=W(t^*,x,\partial)\partial W^{-1}(t^*,x,\partial)$ related to $V\in Gr$.

The flows $V\to G(t)V$ can be related to the Orlov-Schulman operators and the Virasoro algebra in a natural manner (cf. [18, 19]). What one sees here is that the QT features of

KP based on x, ∂ pass directly via anti-isomorphism to QT features for ∂_z, z (or M, L). In particular corresponding phase space variables could be viewed as ζ, z (where $\zeta \sim \partial_z$ in the same way as $p \sim \partial$) and this gives us an entrée to the use of ζ, z as phase space variables as used in [31] and in Section 2. Thus in an obvious way one can expect Moyal type theory based on phase space functions $A(z, \zeta)$ to be deformation quantization equivalent to the generalized QT of z-operators which in turn is anti-isomorphic to the KP theory. The subsequent natural emergence of z-operators z, ∂_z in various formulas then allows one to formulate the dynamical theory directly in terms of Orlov-Schulman operators as in Section 2 and this could all lead to further perspective on vertex operators. ■

References

[1] M. Adler, T. Shiota, and P. vanMoerbeke, Phys. Lett. A, 194 (1994), 33-43; Comm. Math. Phys., 171 (1995), 547-588; solv-int 9812006
[2] M. Adler and P. vanMoerbeke, Comm. Math. Phys., 147 (1992), 25-56
[3] M. Adler and P. vanMoerbeke, Comm. Math. Phys., 203 (1999),185-210 = solv-int 9912014
[4] M. Adler, E. Horozov, and P. vanMoerbeke, Phys. Lett. A, 242 (1998), 139-151
[5] R. Carroll, Quantum theory, deformation, and integrability, North-Holland, 2000
[6] R. Carroll, math.QA 0101072, Applicable Anal., to appear
[7] R. Carroll, math.QA 0101229, Inter. Jour. Math. and Math. Sci., to appear
[8] R. Carroll, Topics in soliton theory, North-Holland, 1991
[9] R. Carroll, Applic. Anal., 49 (1993), 1-31; 56 (1995), 147-164
[10] R. Carroll, Nucl. Phys. B, 502 (1997), 561-593; Lect. Notes Physics 502, Springer, 1998, pp. 33-56
[11] R. Carroll, Jour. Nonlin. Sci., 4 (1994), 519-544
[12] R. Carroll and Y. Kodama, Jour. Phys. A, 28 (1995), 6373-6378
[13] R. Carroll, Q-analysis and integrability, part of a book in preparation
[14] O. Dayi, Jour. Math. Phys., 39 (1998), 485-496
[15] L. Dickey, Lett. Math. Phys., 48 (1999), 277-289
[16] L. Dickey, Acta Appl. Math., 47 (1997), 243-321
[17] L. Dickey, Soliton equations and Hamiltonian systems, World Scientific, 1991
[18] L. Dickey, hep-th 9210155 and 9312015
[19] L. Dickey, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 8 (1993), 1259-1272 and 1357-1377
[20] G. Dunne, Jour. Phys. A, 21 (1988), 2321-2335
[21] P. Fletcher, Phys. Lett. B, 248 (1990), 323-328
[22] P. diFrancesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Sénéchal, Conformal field theory, Springer, 1997; hep-th 9112063
[23] P. diFrancesco and P. Mathieu, hep-th 9109042
[24] E. Frenkel, IMRN, 2 (1996), 55-76
[25] M. Freeman and P. West, hep-th 9208013
[26] D. Galetti and M. Ruzzi, Physica A, 26 (1999), 473-491; 33 (2000), 1065-1082
[27] J. Gawrylczyk, Jour. Phys. A, 28 (1995), 593-605
[28] J. Gawrylczyk, Jour. Math. Phys., 36 (1995), 3461-3478
[29] L. Haine and P. Iliev, Jour. Phys. A, 30 (1997), 7217-7227; Int. Math. Res. Notices, 6 (2000), 281-323
[30] P. Iliev, Jour. Phys. A, 31 (1998), L241-L244; Lett. Math. Phys., 44 (1998), 187-200
[31] R. Kemmoku, Jour. Phys. Soc. Japan, 66 (1997), 51-59
[32] R. Kemmoku and S. Saito, hep-th 9510007; Jour. Phys. Soc. Japan, 65 (1996), 1881-1884
[33] R. Kemmoku and S. Saito, Phys. Lett. B, 319 (1993), 471-477; Jour. Phys. A, 29 (1996), 4141-4148
[34] R. Kemmoku and H. Saito, hep-th 0007122
[35] S. Kharchev, A. Mironov, and A. Morozov, hep-th 9501013
[36] B. Khesin, V. Lyubashenko, and C. Roger, Jour. Fnl. Anal., 143 (1997), 55-97
[37] A. Klimyk and K. Schmüdgen, Quantum groups and their representations, Springer, 1997
[38] B. Kupershmidt, Lett. Math. Phys., 20 (1990), 19-31

[39] B. Kupershmidt and P. Mathieu, Phys. Lett. B, 227 (1989), 245-250

[40] B. Kupershmidt, Discrete Lax equations and differential-difference calculus, Astérisque, 1985

[41] B. Kupershmidt, Lett. Math. Phys., 20 (1990), 19-31

[42] B. Kupershmidt, Elements of superintegrable systems, Reidel, 1987

[43] J. Madore, S. Schraml, P. Schupp, and J. Wess, hep-th 0001203

[44] Y. Manin, Jour. Sov. Math., 11 (1979), 1-122

[45] Y. Manin, Quantum groups and noncommutative geometry, CRM Montréal, 1988; Ann. Inst. Fourier, 371 (1987), 191-205

[46] F. Martinez-Moras and E. Ramos, hep-th 9206040

[47] J. Mas and M. Seco, Jour. Math. Phys., 37 (1996), 6510-6529

[48] J. Matsukidaira, J. Satsuma, and W. Strampp, Jour. Math. Phys., 31 (1990), 1426-1434

[49] P. vanMoerbeke, Lectures on integrable systems, World Scientific, 1994, pp. 163-267

[50] M. Mulase, Inter. Jour. Math., 1 (1990), 293-

[51] O. Ogievetsky, Lett. Math. Phys., 24 (1992), 245-255

[52] A. Orlov and P. Winternitz, solv-int 9701008

[53] A. Orlov and E. Schulman, Lett. Math. Phys., 12 (1986), 171-179; Teor. Mat. Fizika, 64 (1985), 323-328

[54] R. Sasaki and I. Yamanaka, Comm. Math. Phys., 108 (1987), 691-704; Advanced Studies Pure Math., 16 (1988), 271-296

[55] A. Schwarz, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 6 (1991), 611-616; 2713-2725

[56] I. Strachan, Jour. Phys. A, 28 (1995), 1967-1975; Jour. Geom. Phys., 21 (1997), 255-278; hep-th 9606101

[57] K. Takasaki and T. Takebe, Inter. Jour. Mod. Phys. A, Supp. 1992, pp. 889-922; Rev. Math. Phys., 7 (1995), 743-808

[58] F. Treves, Introduction to pseudodifferential operators and Fourier integral operators, Vols. 1 and 2, Plenum Press, 1980

[59] M. Tu, Lett. Math. Phys., 49 (1999), 95-103; hep-th 0103083

[60] A. Volkov, hep-th 9509024

[61] H. Wachter and M. Wohlgenannt, hep-th 0103120

[62] M. Zyskin, hep-th 9504041